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Disclaimer

- **Opinions expressed in this presentation and the associated paper are those of the author – They represent neither the opinions of the TPC nor the author’s employer**
- **But the opinions may have some authority:**
- **Karl Huppler**
  - IBM analyst since 1980.
  - Deeply involved in the performance benchmark community since 1987
  - Actively involved with TPC benchmarks soon after the TPC’s first benchmark was released in 1989.
  - Currently
    - IBM’s primary representative to the TPC,
    - Chairman of the TPC and the TPC’s Steering Committee
    - Chairman of the TPC Pricing Maintenance Committee.
  - Prior – ten years on TPC’s Technical Advisory Board (TAB), where many price-related issues came forward
  - Began leading TPC efforts to enhance rules for price-related metrics in TPC benchmarks in October, 2002, as chair of the workgroup that eventually became the Price Maintenance Committee
Discussion Points

- Advantages of including a price metric
  - And a couple of disadvantages
- Price, in relation to TCO
- Price-related challenges and proposed enhancements
Why include price?

- Consider...>
- Both have 1 engine and space for 2 passengers
- If the “benchmark” involves capacity to tow a large load, the truck has a clear advantage
- However, the “performance” is only part of the story
- Clearly, the truck costs more to purchase and more to maintain – You would not buy it if the “quality of service” you needed could be satisfied by the car
- This is an exaggerated example: The differences are visible and clear - - - not always the case with computer systems and software
  - The use of high-priced fast memory, deep-sorted processors, expensive custom software, etc. can all be hidden from “view”
TPC’s Innovation

- **Price/Performance as a Primary Metric**
  - Some benchmarks require a “bill of material” to allow the reader to research the price
  - TPC includes Price and Availability Date as Primary Metrics that are equal in stature to the Performance Metric
    - Forces Price anomalies to be very visible when comparing Results
    - Provides the “economy car” with a $/passenger metric to compete with the large truck

- **TPC’s Total Solution perspective**
  - Price includes: Server, Storage, Software, Networking; and originally included workstations
  - Also includes a level of maintenance
  - Enhances the value of the price/performance metric
  - Relies on the benchmark to require a “normal” configuration
Is there a down-side to a price-related metric?

- Performance is measureable
- Prerequisite functionality is testable
- Price is a function of Marketing – full of intangible, less than scientific influences that are difficult to measure and verify

- There are ways to improve the opportunity for the represented price to be measureable and verifiable - - fundamentally focused on delivery of a price that is meaningful to the ultimate customer
Price (particularly TPC Price) and Total Cost of Ownership

- With the inclusion of ongoing maintenance, TPC Price is sometimes referred to as “Cost of Ownership”
- It is NOT “Total” Cost of Ownership

- TPC Price covers the items in the list that are in *blue italic text.*
  - TPC Price is important, because these areas are important parts of TCO
  - The relevancy of TPC Price depends on how well it reflects reality for these components, for a “typical” environment

- **TCO includes:**
  - *Initial HW cost*
  - *Initial OS, Middleware, Database SW* cost
  - Initial Application SW cost
  - HW upgrade cost
  - OS/Middleware/Database SW upgrades cost
  - Application upgrades cost
  - **HW maintenance**
  - *OS/Middleware/ Database maintenance*
  - Application maintenance
  - Application set-up, customization
  - DB administration
  - Systems operations
  - Electricity
  - Floor-space, building costs
  - Training
  - Unscheduled down-time costs
  - Scheduled down-time costs
  - And more…..
“Reality Configurations”

- The first TPC-C Price/Performance leader was published in September of 1992
  - 33.81 tpmC at $2462 USD/tpmC
  - 30 simulated users
  - 24 MB of memory
  - 5 disk drives totaling 3.7GB

- The current (as of 27 August, 2010) TPC-C Price/Performance leader is somewhat different
  - 290,040 tpmC at $0.39 USD/tpmC
  - 240,000 simulated users
  - 96 GB (98,304 MB) of memory
  - 13,928.3 GB of storage split between
    - 24 Solid State Devices
    - 25 Rotating Disk
  - Supported by 3 additional “client” servers handling application logic

- Some differences
  - Workstations no longer included in price
  - Physical storage requirements reduced to 1/3

- In 1992, the overall path of the database transactions and associated application were close to reality
- The rapid growth in compute technology has enabled transactions of greater and greater complexity

Application Trends

- While at the same time, HW and SW suppliers have worked to dramatically improve the TPC-C transaction path
  - This does not mean that TPC-C is without value – It is simply no longer a “total system” benchmark
The TPC’s Transition

The TPC has made a conscious and intelligent choice to shift from “total system” benchmarks to Database “subsystem” benchmarks

Applications optimized for specific needs.
DB transactions modeled after the 80-column card
Total System included dedicated, attached workstations, roll-your-own order-entry-like applications, with minimal other activity

Extensive use of portable, maintainable application management tools.
Broad mix of business-optimization applications that are far more complex than were possible on 1990 servers
DB transactions much more complex, but “applications” have grown faster
Total System much, much more variable and difficult to define and compare
The TPC’s Transition – Affect on Price

Resources configured to support the database-only activity are exaggerated from “reality”

Typical “other” components use more processor and less disk or memory - - forcing DB Subsystem benchmarks to configure far more disk and memory than would be “typical”

Resulting configuration is one that only “atypical” consumers would use.

The best way to verify a market-driven quantity like price, is to verify that someone in the “market” has paid it - - but this is difficult when the configurations used are not configurations that many would buy.
Improvement Recommendation: Reduce the “Priced Configuration”

Each benchmark is artificially focused on DB activity:
- Less other activity in system
- Driven to 100% of capacity

Recommendation: Each benchmark should adjust the amount of the configuration that is priced to reverse this - - - yielding priced configurations that are more representative of what is typically installed.
### Other Potential Areas of Improvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommended Change</th>
<th>Why</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Require all products to be orderable on day result is announced</td>
<td>Easier to verify pricing; mechanisms exist for pricing upgrades to existing products if new versions are not available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change Availability Window from 185 days to 90 days</td>
<td>Easier to verify pricing; proven to work in other organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Require perpetual software licenses</td>
<td>Consistent with the treatment of hardware, with residual value at the end of the “price period” of the benchmark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create a “reality-based” licensing requirement, similar to the “reduced hardware” recommendation</td>
<td>Deliver a priced configuration more in line with what consumers typically purchase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Require 5 years of maintenance</td>
<td>Matches typical depreciation schedules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Split first year and “per year” prices</td>
<td>More closely matches “Capital” and “Expense”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Require much more robust maintenance, including education, software updates, operator assist</td>
<td>More reflective of consumer reality – easier to verify</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recommendations Affect on TCO Measures (1 of 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TCO Element</th>
<th>Included in TPC-Price?</th>
<th>Affect of Recommendations</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial HW cost</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Improved</td>
<td>More “consumer-appropriate” configuration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial OS, Middleware, Database SW cost</td>
<td>OS &amp; DB</td>
<td>Improved</td>
<td>Perpetual licenses on a “typical” number of processor cores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial Application SW cost</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>not possible to include in a generic benchmark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HW upgrades cost</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Can be a key factor in a purchase decision, but is not included, here.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS/Middleware/Database SW upgrades cost</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Proposed support costs include SW upgrades</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application upgrades cost</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Another missing element that cannot be in a generic benchmark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HW maintenance</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Improved</td>
<td>Extending from 3 to 5 years and differentiating between capital and expense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS/Middleware/ Database maintenance</td>
<td>OS &amp; DB</td>
<td>Much Improved</td>
<td>Requiring a more robust level of support that is appropriate for mission-critical computing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application maintenance</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>See other “application” entries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application set-up, customization</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>See other “application” entries</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Recommendations Affect on TCO Measures (2 of 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TCO Element</th>
<th>Included in TPC-Price?</th>
<th>Affect of Recommendations</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DB administration</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>Includes a level of operational support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systems operations</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Minor</td>
<td>Includes a level of operational support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No, but</td>
<td>This growing area of cost of ownership is covered by the TPC’s new TPC-Energy metrics, available on all TPC benchmarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floor-space, building costs</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>This is quantifiable area that could be a candidate for inclusion in a future price metric.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Included in support/maintenance recommendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unscheduled down-time costs</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>While it is difficult to quantify, this is not only a major part of the TCO, but can be extremely disruptive to the business. See the proposal in the TPC-TC ’09 from Marco Vielra and Henrique Maderia, recommending the creation of a “dependability” benchmark.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduled down-time costs</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>If a resiliency benchmark is created, it should cover both planned and unplanned down-time</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary

- The inclusion of Price/Performance and Availability Date Primary Metrics enhances the value of TPC Benchmarks

- However, the value of any metric is based on its ability to represent relevant information for the business model of the benchmark

- A number of improvements can be made to enhance the ability of the TPC’s Price/Performance and Availability metrics to more closely match consumer reality – Thereby enhancing the overall value of these metrics and TPC benchmarks